

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/039,299	HARRINGTON, STEVEN J.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mike Rahmjoo	2676	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Mike Rahmjoo.

(3) Joseph Dreher.

(2) Matt Bella.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 10 March 2005.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Naegle et al (US Pub 2001003287)

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: _____.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Applicant's representative discussed the invention in light of the specification pertaining to claim 1 and in particular "the associative operation" aspect of claim 1.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required